




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,635	01/21/2004	Dean Jeffrey Schneider	1001-071C1	3345
25215	7590	09/07/2004	EXAMINER	
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC 401 S OLD WOODWARD AVE SUITE 311 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			KLEBE, GERALD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3618	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/761,635	Applicant(s) SCHNEIDER ET AL.	
	Examiner Gerald B. Klebe	Art Unit 3618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


31 Aug 2004

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/16/2004</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Amendment

1. The preliminary amendment filed 1/21/2004 cancelled claims 1-20 and added new claims 21-42. Claims 21 - 42 are pending in the application; claims 21, 31, and 39 being independent.

Claims Objections - Informalities

2. The claims are objected-to for the following informalities:

Claim 21 in line 19: the recitation “ the seond surface of the first and seond members”; based on the examiner’s understanding of the disclosure, the recitation would appear to be more precisely written as -- the second surfaces of each of the first and the second members--.

Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC §112, Second Para.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 21-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 in line 15, claim 31 in line 17, and claim 39 in line 20 each recite the limitation “a first and second surface”. It is unclear whether what is being claimed is a cavity defined by a surface called the “first and second surface” or whether what is being claimed is a cavity defined by a first surface and a second surface or whether some other structure is being claimed.

Claim 26 in line 1 recites the limitation “the second surface”; there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3618

Claim 27 in lines 1-2 recites "wherein the first and second surface ... are both part of".

It is not clear whether there are two surfaces claimed by the recitation "the first and second surface" or whether, being singular, it is one surface addressed as "the first and second surface".

Appropriate correction is required.

For the purposes of further examination on the merits, the recitation "first and second surface" will be interpreted as meaning a first surface and a second surface.

Claims Rejections - Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 21-24, and 39-40, as best understood, are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,729,425 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious variations.

7. Claims 31-34, 36-38, and 41-42, as best understood, are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 19 of

Art Unit: 3618

U.S. Patent No. 6,729,425 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious variations.

8. Claims 25 and 35, as best understood, are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,729,425 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious variations.

Prior Art made of Record

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The prior art of Miura et al teaches a foamable expandable reinforcing material which is semi-hardened to be flexible prior to use and is used to reinforce a resin sheet that is bonded to a structural panel to be strengthened; Yoshida et al. teaches a reinforcement material for an automobile front pillar; Gallagher et al. teach a method for making plastic foam-backed shell that extends over the remaining outer skin layer of a thin-sheet structural panel; Takabatake teaches a support structure including a foamable material located in a cavity of a hollow structural member. These references also show other features in common with some other features disclosed in the instant application.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communication(s) from the examiner should be directed to Gerald B. Klebe at 703-305-0578, fax 703-872-9306; Mon.-Fri., 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM ET, or to Supervisory Patent Examiner Christopher P. Ellis, Art Unit 3618, at 703-308-2560.

Official correspondence should be sent to the following TC 3600 Official Rightfax numbers as follows: Regular correspondence: 703-872-9326; After Finals: 703-872-9327; Customer Service: 703-872-9325.

Art Unit: 3618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gbklebe
gbklebe / Art Unit 3618 / 1 September 2004



CHRISTOPHER P. ELLIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 6000